

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of **June 28, 2005**. Reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 18-23, and 25-26 are respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-8, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,304,898 issued to Shiigi.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,577,907, issued to Czyszczewski et al.

Claims 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiigi, as applied to claims 5 and 18 above, and further in view of Patent Number 6,609,121 issued to Ambrosini et al.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiigi, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 6,577,907, issued to Czyszczewski et al.

The Present Amendment

Previously withdrawn claims 10-17 are now canceled. Dependent claims 2, 5, and 24 are now canceled since their subject matter is covered by one or more of the pending independent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended, which is supported by for example canceled claim 5 and/or canceled claim 24, and/or paragraphs [0026] to [0029], or [0030] to [0033] of the present specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 18 and 25, which are also supported by one or more of these sections.

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claims 1-8, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,304,898 issued to Shiigi.

Shiigi discusses a directory of authorized users (User directory 222) (column 4, lines 31-36, and lines 63-65). This directory is used to determine which users can use the graphical email handling software of Shiigi. It is not a personal address database of a user as recited in claim 1 and thus the recited features of claim 1 that are associated with the personal address database are not taught or suggested by Shiigi.

Furthermore, the user directory 222 taught by Shiigi is part of the server 220 (see Figure 1B). The user directory 222 is controlled by the server 220 and thus its location is known. Therefore, Shiigi fails to teach or suggest retrieving, from a first server, a location of a personal database associated to the user identifier where the location identifies a second server and retrieving, from the second server, the at least one destination address from the personal database associated to the user identifier as recited in claim 1.

Since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by the reference, claim 1 patentably distinguish over the reference. Accordingly, claims 3-4 and 6-9 dependent from claim 1 also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shiigi. Based on the explanation above, Shiigi fails to teach or suggest a system where personal address databases are associated to user identifiers in one server and where a personal address database itself is

maintained in a remote location on a different server. Therefore, Shiigi fails to teach or suggest the claimed means for retrieving, from the first server, a location of a personal address database associated to the user identifier where the location identifies a second server that has access to the personal address database associated with the user identifier. Shiigi further fails to teach or suggest the claimed means for communicating being further configured for establishing communication between the system and the second server to allow access to the personal address database as recited in claim 18.

Since claim 18 recites features not taught or suggested by the reference, claim 18 patentably distinguish over the reference. Accordingly, claims 19-23 dependent therefrom also patentably distinguish over the references and are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 25

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,577,907, issued to Czystczewski et al.

Czystczewski teaches a corporate security database 180 and a corporate directory database 185 (column 9, lines 38-54). The security database 180 verifies the identify and access privileges of a particular user (column 9, lines 38-40). The corporate directory 185 includes user profiles, telephone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses of users (column 9, lines 43-46). Although the directory 185 is a directory, it is not a personal address book database as recited in claim 25 and is not a database that is associated to a user identifier as recited in claim 25. With the presently claimed multifunctional device, many different users can have their own personal database associated to them that is accessible by each specific user. Czystczewski only has one general corporate directory that is most likely limited to employee data. The corporate directory 185 of Czystczewski belongs to no user and thus the recited features of claim 25 that are associated to a personal address book directory are not taught or suggested by Czystczewski.

Therefore, the recited means for communicating with a first server, the first server including user information comprising associations between user identifiers and locations of personal address book databases is not taught or suggested by Czystczewski. The recited means

for retrieving, from the first server, a location of a personal address book database associated to the user identifier where the location identifies a second server is not taught or suggested by Czyszczewski. The recited means for communicating being further configured for establishing communication between the multifunctional device and the second server and means for accessing the personal address book database via the second server is not taught or suggested by Czyszczewski.

Since claim 25 recites features not taught or suggested by the references, claim 25 patentably distinguish over the references. Accordingly, dependent claim 26 also patentably distinguishes over the references and is in condition for allowance.


Claims 9 and 21

Claims 9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiigi, and further in view of Ambrosini et al. In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 18, Ambrosini fails cure the shortcomings of Shiigi since Ambrosini was only used by the Office Action to show a lightweight directory access protocol. Therefore, claims 9 and 21 patentably distinguish over the references of record since their independent claims 1 and 18, respectively, have been shown to patentably distinguish over the references of record.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 18-23, and 25-26** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843